

DEMAND No. 56.—PAYMENT TO RETRENCHED PERSONNEL.

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 14,700 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the period from 1st November 1956 to end of 31st day of March 1957, in respect of ‘Payments to Retrenchment Personnel’.”

DEMAND No. 57.—SCHEMES CONNECTED WITH STATE SCHEMES OF GOVERNMENT TRADING.

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,65,17,400 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the period from 1st November 1956 to end of 31st day of March 1957, in respect of ‘Capital Outlay on Schemes of State Trading’.”

DEMAND No. 58.—ADVANCES AND LOANS.

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,08,82,600 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the period from 1st November 1956 to end of 31st day of March 1957, in respect of ‘Loans and Advances by the State Government’.”

MYSORE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956.

Introduction.

Sri T. MARIAPPA (Minister for Finance).—Sir, I beg to introduce the Mysore Appropriation Bill, 1956.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Mysore Appropriation Bill, 1956 is introduced.

Motion to consider.

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—I beg to move :

“That the Mysore Appropriation Bill, 1956, be taken into consideration.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

“That the Mysore Appropriation Bill, 1956, be taken into consideration.”

(Sri B. HUTCHES GOWDA rose)

Mr. SPEAKER.—I must tell the Hon'ble Member that the scope of the discussion is very limited. As the Demands have been already granted by the House, the scope is extremely limited.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ (ತುರುವೇಕೆರೆ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ವಿಶೇಷವಾಗಿ ಒಂದೆರಡು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಮೊದಲನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ಅವರಿಗೂ ನಮಗೂ ಒಂದು ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಮ್ಮತವಿದೆ. ಏನೆಂದರೆ, ಏನಾದರೂ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾದರೆ, ವಾಸ್ತವಾಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ದೇಶದ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಡಿ ಎಂದು ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ನಾನು ಇಷ್ಟು ಮಾತ್ರ ಭರವಸೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಾವು ಸುಳ್ಳು ವಿಚಾರ ಒಂದನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ವಾಸ್ತವವಾಗಿ ದೇಶದ ಸ್ಥಿತಿ, ಮತ್ತು ಆಯವ್ಯಯ ಹೇಗಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಚಾಚೂ ತಪ್ಪದೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇವೆ. . . .

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಉಂಟಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಹೇಳುವ ಪ್ರಸಂಗ ಬಂದರೆ ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಹಿಂದೆ ಯಾವುದೋ ಒಂದು ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರೋ ಒಂದು ಮಾತು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಸರಿಕಾಣುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ತಮ್ಮ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದರೆಂಬುದು ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುವಂಥ ಪ್ರಸಂಗ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಈಗ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—ನಾವು ನಿಜಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ದೇಶದ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಮಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕಳವಳವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತ ಪಡಿಸಿದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ತಪ್ಪು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಡಿಫಿಟಿಟ್ ಬಡ್ಡೆಟ್ ಇದೆಯಾದ್ದರಿಂದ ಕಂದಾಯ ವೆಚ್ಚ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಇತರ ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಕಂದಾಯವನ್ನು, ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗೆ, ಕೊಡಗಿನಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ Agriculture Income-Tax ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆಲ್ಲ ಈ ಕಡೆಯದು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಂಡರೆ, ಕಡಮೆ ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಕಡೆಗೆ

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಮರಿಯಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಮಲ್ಲಪ್ಪನವರು ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು, ನಡೆಸುರು ಹೇಳಿದುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಿದೆ. ನಾನು ಆ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ಸಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ, ಅಂಕಿ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಸಂಗ್ರಹಮಾಡಿ ಆ ಅಂಕಿ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ತೆರಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಹಾಕಬಹುದೇ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದನೇ ಹೊರತು ಕೊಡಗಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವಂತೆ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇರುವ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಬೇರೆ ಇದೆ. ಈಗ ಬಡ್ಡೆಟ್ ಡಿಮ್ಯಾಂಡ್‌ಗಳು ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಬಡ್ಡೆಟ್ ಪೇರೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದರು, ಮಾನ್ಯ

ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದರು ಎನ್ನುವ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಪಾಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದಂಥ ಬೇಡಿಕೆಗಳೇನಿವೆಯೋ ಅವುಗಳಿಗೆ ಈ ಅಪ್ರೋಪ್ರಿಯೇಷನ್ ಬಿಲ್ ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿದೆಯೋ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ, ಅದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೀರೋ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ, ಈ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಇವೆಷ್ಟೇ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳು ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇರುವುದು. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಬಡ್ಡೆಟ್ ಮೇಲಿನ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ವಾದವಿವಾದಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ನಡೆಯಿತೆಂಬ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಇದರ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿ ಬಹಳ ಕಡಮೆ ಇದೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಎಲ್ಲೆಯೂ, ಹೌಸ್ ಆಫ್ ಕಾಮನ್ಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೂಡ, ಐದು, ಹತ್ತು ನಿಮಿಷಗಳಿಗಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಬಡ್ಡೆಟ್ ನಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಪಾಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದರೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಮೂಲದಿನಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅದರಿಂದ ಈ ವಿಷಯಕ್ಕೆ ವಾದವಿವಾದ ಇರಬೇಕಾದ್ದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಿಂದೆ ವಾದವಾದಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದುದನ್ನೇ ತಾವು ಸಮರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಅಷ್ಟೊಂದು ಸರಿಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಹೇಳಿಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದ್ದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅತ್ಯಲ್ಪ ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ವಿನಿಯೋಗಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಲಕ್ಷ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟು ತಾವೇನಾದರೂ ಹೇಳುವುದಿದರೆ ಸಾಲು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಉಪಯೋಗವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—ಐದು ನಿಮಿಷಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಾಲ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ವಿರೋಧ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ, ಅರ್ಥಿಕ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹಾಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದರು, ಹೀಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದರು ಎಂದು ವಿವರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—ವಿವರಣೆ ಮಾಡದೆ ವಿರೋಧ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. We can only oppose on the basis of the statements made by the Finance Minister and the accounts given here. ಈ ಹಣವನ್ನು authorise ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬುದು ನನ್ನ ಮುಖ್ಯ ವಿಷಯ. ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದನ್ನು ನಾವು quote ಮಾಡದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ವಿರೋಧ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಅರಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಹಿಂದೆ ಇದ್ದುದನ್ನು ಎತ್ತಿಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಇವರು ಏನು ಆಡಳಿತ ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. 25 ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಇನ್‌ವೆಸ್ಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ಸ್ ಹಿಂದೆ ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವ 16 ಕೋಟಿಗೆ ಇಳಿಸಿದರು ; 12 ಕೋಟಿ ರಿಸರ್ವ್ ಫಂಡ್ ಇದ್ದುದನ್ನು ತಿಂದದ್ದು ಯಾರು, ಮತ್ತು ಒಂಭತ್ತು ಕೋಟಿ additional loan ಮಾಡಿದ್ದು ಯಾರು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ತಾವು ಗಮನಿಸಬೇಕು.

ಇನ್ನೊಂದೇನೆಂದರೆ 'equal pay for equal work' ಎಂದ, ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯೊಳಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಸಮಾನವಾದ ಸಂಬಳ ಸಾರಿಗೆಗಳಿರಬೇಕು. ಬಹಳ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವಿರಕೂಡದು, discrimination ಇರಕೂಡದು. ಯಾರಿಗಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಕುಟುಂಬದ ಜೀವನಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗುವಷ್ಟಾದರೂ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಎರಡು ಸಾವಿರ ಬರುವವರಿಗೆ ಸಾಲು ಸಾವಿರಕ್ಕೆ ಏರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ 500 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಇಳಿಸಿ, ಇತರರಿಗೆ ನೂರು ರೂಪಾಯಿಗೆ ಕಡಮೆ ಇಲ್ಲದಂತೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು

ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಬಹುದು. ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ನೌಕರರ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಬ್ಬರಿಗೊಬ್ಬರಿಗೆ ಸಮಾನ ಕೆಲಸ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಮಾನ ಸಂಬಳ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಯಾವ ಕಾರಣದಿಂದ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆನ್ನುವುದು ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದ ಜೀವನ ಮಟ್ಟ, ನಮ್ಮ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯು ಮಟ್ಟ ಮತ್ತು ನಮಗೆ ಬರತಕ್ಕ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಅದನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಒಂದೇ ಸಮಾನಾಗಿ ಎಲ್ಲರನ್ನೂ ನೋಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈ ವಾದವನ್ನು ಮುಂದಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಒಂದು ಸಹಕಾರ ಇಲಾಖೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ ಅದರಿಂದ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ, ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟರ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಉಪಕಾರವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ನೋಡಬೇಕು. ಎಷ್ಟೋ ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ನಾವು ರೈತರ ಬುಣಪರಿಹಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾರ್ಗ ಮಾಡಿ, ಜೀವನ ಮಟ್ಟ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅದರಿಂದ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಉಪಕಾರವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಂದಾಯವನ್ನು ಹೊರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಮರ್ಥ್ಯ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ರೈತನ ಬುಣಪರಿಹಾರಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಹಣವನ್ನೇನೋ ಒದಗಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮದರಾಸು ಪ್ರಾಂತದಲ್ಲಿ ಶೇಕಡ ಮೂರರ ಬಡ್ಡಿ ಮೇಲೆ ಹಣ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೆ ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಶೇಕಡ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಮುಕಾಲ ರಂತೆ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಸಾಲ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಕಡಮೆ ಬಡ್ಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಲದ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವರು ಹೇಳುವುದೆಲ್ಲ ಬೇರೆ ಕಣ್ಣಿನಿಂದ ನೋಡುವುದುಗಳು. ಇವರು ಇಷ್ಟೊಂದು ಕೆಲಸ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಶೇಕಡ ಹತ್ತರಷ್ಟು ಕೂಡ ಸಾಧಿಸಲಾರರು. ಇವರು ಜನರ ಆಶೋತ್ತರಗಳನ್ನು ನೆರವೇರಿಸುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟೊ ಅಸಕ್ತಿ ವಹಿಸುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಆ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ನಾನು ಈ ಮನೋದೇಯನ್ನು ತೀವ್ರವಾಗಿ ವಿರೋಧಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಸಂಬಳ ಸಾರಿಗೆಗಳ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದರೆ, ಒಬ್ಬ ನೆರ್ವಿಸ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಅವನ ಸೀನಿಯಾರಿಟಿ ಮುಂತಾದವನ್ನು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಸಹಾನುಭೂತಿಯಿಂದ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಧರ್ಮಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾರಿಗೂ ಏನೂ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಗಳ ಭಾಗಗಳಿಂದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಬಂದು ಒಂದೆಡೆ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇವರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಡಮೆ ಸಂಬಳ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೂ ಕೂಡ ಸತ್ಯನಿಷ್ಠೆಯಿಂದ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿದವರಿಗೆ ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಬಾರದು. ನ್ಯಾಯವಾದ ಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದರೆ, ಕನಿಕರ ತೋರಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆ, ಸಹಾನುಭೂತಿಯಿಂದ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಅರ್ಥವಿಲ್ಲದ ಮಾತು. ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ನ್ಯಾಯದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I would like to bring to the notice of the Hon'ble Members once again the real scope of the Appropriation Bill. The demands have now been passed and whatever demands that were passed are now contained in the Appropriation Bill. If the Hon'ble Members find that there is a difference between the demands

(MR. SPEAKER.)

just now granted and the Appropriation Bill, they can offer remarks. But, speaking beyond that scope will not be correct. Of course there are many things which I have to tolerate. I may tell by experience during the last ten years that in other Assemblies speeches are not made on the Appropriation Bill at all. If there are any figures which do not tally with the demands that have now been granted, Hon'ble Members are free to offer remarks.

*Sri S. S. KOLKEBAIL (Bramhavar).—Government is asking power to spend 58 crores of rupees. We have to discuss how that amount should be spent, how the officers are not spending it properly and so on.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The point is not as to how the officers spend the amount or whether Government is going to spend the amount you have granted. But the point is whether the Appropriation Bill is in consonance with the amounts just now granted to the Government.

Sri S. S. KOLKEBAIL.—The Audit Report is placed on the Table of the House. It deals with the Appropriation Accounts. Unless and until we say that the officer concerned is not using the money properly, or he is misusing the money, it is not possible to proceed with the debate. We have to say all that.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is occasion for Hon'ble Members to discuss the Appropriation Accounts in the Estimates Committee and the Public Accounts Committee. I am not concerned with it now. When the amounts were granted, they were granted on the understanding that Government would spend them in the proper way. But the scope of debate on an Appropriation Bill is very much limited, and I request Hon'ble Members to stick to it. I am aware that this means some hardship to the Members. But I would like to place before the House that in other Assemblies no speeches are made and the Appropriation Bill is not contested at all.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—I want to point out that Demands have not been put before the House and passed individually. Further, I beg to submit to the Chair that clause (3) of the Bill says :

“The sums authorised to be paid and applied from and out of the Consolidated Fund of the State by this Act shall be appropriated for the services and purposes expressed in the Schedule in relation to the period, etc.”

Even though the Budget Estimates have been passed, have we not the power to say ‘withhold this sanction’?

Mr. SPEAKER.—There are two modes of putting the Demands to the House. The modes differ from place to place. In some Assemblies the Demands are put one by one. In Lok Sabha all the Demands are put together. I have followed the Lok Sabha method. In fact in Bombay we were following the other method, that is, taking up each Demand and putting them one by one. At the initial stage when I put the Demands to the House if Hon'ble Members had raised the point that Demands should be put one by one, I would have taken it into consideration. Out of the two modes I have followed the one method which is followed in Lok Sabha. That point is closed. If Hon'ble Members want to offer their remarks as regards clause 3, I have no objection.

Sri S. S. KOLKEBAIL.—Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is a small Bill though the amount covered by it is nearly 58 crores of rupees. By your ruling you have already circumscribed the scope of the speech. Anyway what I want to submit to the House through you is that the money that has to be voted by us should be spent by the Government, should be spent properly and correctly. Some of us have come from A States; some have come from B States and some from C States also. Similarly, Officers have also come from A, B and C States. I am not saying that the officers of the A States are more efficient and the officers of the B and C States are inefficient. But, all the same, the feeling is that the controlling officers

who have to spend the entire amount voted by us, both voted and also charged amount, are spending lavishly as could be seen from the Audit Report.

5 P.M.

Sri N. HUCHMASTHY GOWDA (Huliyurdurga).—On a point of Order, Sir. ಎಧಾನಸಭೆಯು ನಿಯಮಾವಳಿಯು 130ನೆಯ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಎರಡನೆಯ ಸಬ್ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is suspended.

***Sri S. S. KOLKEBAIL.**—Mr. Speaker, Sir, our main complaint from the beginning was that at the time of integration, officers from Madras, Bombay and other areas especially the Heads of Departments and other Gazetted Officers should have to been taken in the new Mysore State. We are told that the then Mysore Government which was the spearhead of Karnataka refused to take most of the officers and thus we find that most of our efficient officers have been left out. Of course there are some officers who have come from other areas, like the Chief Secretary and the Financial Secretary, but most of the Heads of Departments who are authorised to spend huge amounts are people who have been trained in part B States. So, my request to the Government is that at least we must get some trained officers who belong to the Kannada areas whom we have left back either in Madras or Bombay. We have got nearly 28 I.A.S. Officers belonging to the Karnataka area working in other States. If you cannot get them directly, you can even approach the Central Government requesting them to spare their services to our State.

Mr. SPEAKER.—May I know how it is relevant to the point at issue now?

Sri S. S. KOLKEBAIL.—Relevant in the sense that we are going to entrust these sums to be spent through the controlling authority.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have been saying that it is irrelevant but the Hon'ble Member is persisting.

Sri S. S. KOLKEBAIL.—Anyway I have said what all I wanted to say.

In the Appropriation Bill, we find a schedule wherein some amount has been allotted for fisheries. I request

the Government to spend this amount in the right direction.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have been telling the Hon'ble Member to offer relevant remarks on the Bill because the scope on the Appropriation Bill is very much limited. I may inform the Hon'ble the Members that in the Bombay Assembly it so happened that the Chair had to ring the bell and make the members to sit down.

Sri S. S. KOLKEBAIL.—With respect to the Chair, I may also say that in the Madras Assembly, we were discussing almost every point and in fact sometimes repeating the arguments. I am rather habituated to repeat the arguments, Sir. Anyway the amount that has been included in the Appropriation Bill may be properly spent through the Heads of Departments. If you spend the money on fisheries, we can augment the food position of the country. Without food proteins we cannot survive but we have to supplement the food with proteins obtained from flesh and fish. This could be done only by improving our livestock and improving our fisheries. I would rather go to the extent of saying that one fish a day keeps the doctor away. There is a proverb in English that "one apple a day keeps the doctor away". The same proverb could be applied in the case of fish also. My main purpose in getting up and speaking on the Appropriation Bill was to impress upon the Government the need for improving the fisheries in South Kanara and the amount provided in the Bill should be well-spent by the department. That is all. Thank you!

***Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR** (T. Narasipur).—I rise to oppose this Bill, Sir, for the following reasons. The Hon'ble Speaker has been pleased to give rulings on two occasions: (1) when it was contended that by virtue of the provisions of the States Reorganisation Act, these estimates should not have been placed before this House, (2) whether the Governor had the authority to issue further appropriation subsequent to the appointed day. On these two occasions, the Hon'ble the Speaker was pleased to give ruling that

(SRI S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.)

the subjects were in order. But on the occasion of the first ruling, the Hon'ble the Speaker was pleased to say that, whether it would be necessary to place an Appropriation Bill or not, is under the active consideration of the Speaker. I would like to know whether a ruling would be given on that point; or whether I have misunderstood or misread that first ruling. I want to have that information, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is no question of the rulings being misunderstood at all. After all they are very clear. And of course, under Section 70 of the States Reorganisation Act, it was not necessary for the Government to place this budget before the House. Still, as a matter of courtesy, after consulting the Legislative Department, it was thought that it was better that the budget should be placed before the House. Then there was another question, that is, with regard to the scope of the discussion. Under the strict interpretation of Section 70 of the States Reorganisation Act, it was not permissible for us to vote on them, but even then, the Government asked for a vote. We have voted the Demands for Grants. When we have voted the Demands, naturally the Appropriation Bill follows. That is why the Appropriation Bill is placed before the House. I do not want to take shelter under the strict interpretation of Section 70 of the States Reorganisation Act. I have been telling the House that if I had taken a strict view the Budget would not have been discussed and no voting would have taken place and no Appropriation Bill would have been brought forward. We have liberally construed the whole position. The Government of India have also expressed the view that though voting might be unnecessary, it might be gone through. Naturally when the voting has taken place, the Appropriation Bill has to follow.

SRI S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—Thank you very much, Sir. Sir, clause 2 of the Bill relates to issue of 58 and odd crores of rupees out of the Consolidated Fund of the Mysore State. If this

clause is passed into law, this legislation runs the risk of redundancy. Under Section 70 of the States Reorganisation Act, an authorisation has already been made and the Government is drawing funds from 1st of November 1956 and the Accountant-General is certifying that expenditure, and therefore, a clause for its authorisation, is covered under an enactment of Parliament. I think this would be absolutely redundant. Therefore, I oppose clause 2 of this Bill. The relevant proviso of the S.R. draft Bill had been drafted specifically. In that Bill the provision was that, even though the Rajpramukh was authorised to meet the expenditure for the period of 5 months ending with 31st March 1957 out of the Consolidated Fund of the new State, there was also another provision in it that, when the Legislature of the new State met, its sanction should be obtained. But when that Bill was passed into an Act in Parliament, the Parliament deleted that provision. So, the position, as it stands today, is that the Rajpramukh has the full authority to authorise the expenditure. Therefore, my submission is that, when authorisation is already there to draw money from the Consolidated Fund of the State, further authorisation carries very little meaning. I perfectly agree with the Hon'ble the Speaker that, when the budget estimates are placed before the House in pursuance of Article 202 of the Constitution of India, Articles 203 and 204 follow. So, I have absolutely no objection to that. But, the Government should have thought in a different way. We are a sovereign body. We have every right to discuss the budget estimates. By virtue of section 70 of the States Reorganisation Act, the executive authority of the State has been authorised to spend and this sovereign body should have the right to scrutinise the budget estimates and point out to Government where they should refrain from expenditure. If the Government had only moved a resolution introducing the budget estimates, perhaps it would have been much better and we would not have run this risk of redundancy.

Mr. SPEAKER.—As points of law are involved in this, I think I must make them quite clear. I think the Hon'ble Member Sri Srinivasa Iyengar has been rather too late in raising these points. He ought to have raised them on the first day when we started discussing the budget estimates. Then, I would have given the same reply that I propose to give now. The point is that we are not discussing the budget; nor is the budget presented to the House under article 202 of the Constitution. Of course, we have followed a new procedure. Government need not have placed this budget before the House and if they so desired, they might have asked us to discuss it only and do nothing more than that. But it was good on the part of Government to have asked us to vote on the Demands. If the Hon'ble Member Sri Srinivasa Iyengar thinks that we are now discussing the budget strictly under articles 202, 203 and 204 of the Constitution, I must brush up his memory and say that that is not so. As far as possible we are following the spirit of articles 202, 203 and 204 but we are not strictly following those Articles. Section 70 does not require Government to place this budget before us. This is an extraordinary thing. So, this has been done in order to take the House into the confidence of Government.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—I am indeed grateful to the Hon'ble the Speaker for having cleared my doubt. If the budget estimates are not placed before this House under Article 202 of the Constitution of India, then this Appropriation Bill does not follow. If the budget estimates are placed before this House in pursuance of Article 202 of the Constitution, then it is obligatory on the part of Government to place this Appropriation Bill before the House. If that is not so, then it is not obligatory on the part of Government to place this Appropriation Bill before the House. Therefore, I press my claim that it is not obligatory and it is better that the Bill is withdrawn because the authorisation is already there.

***Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN (Kolar).**—I want to add to what Sri Srinivasa Iyengar has said. It may help you to appreciate our difficulties and answer straightaway. If I remember aright, you were pleased to remark that is not a budget presented to this House strictly under Article 202 of the Constitution. May I ask in all humility whether there is any other provision of the Constitution under which we can discuss it because discussion of budget in the Legislative Assembly must arise out of a constitutional provision. If you concede, as you have done in a way, that Article 202 is not attracted in this case, surely you do not mean to suggest that, under section 70 of the States Reorganisation Act, there is anything like a budget coming before us. So, if Article 202 is not attracted and if the States Reorganisation Act does not provide for the consideration of this budget by this Hon'ble House, then the position is that the whole thing will be *ultra vires*. In a way, you are following the procedure arising out of Article 202. There seems to be some difficulty. Possibly, I have not been able to follow you correctly. Will you please help me?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have been saying that we are not discussing the budget strictly under Articles 202, 203 and 204 of the Constitution. I have also said that it was not necessary for the Government to place the budget before this House, but it was thought proper to do so. That was not done in consonance with the articles of the Constitution. That was an extra act. Whether the Hon'ble Members believe it or not, this point was discussed and it was thought proper to place this budget before this House not because Article 202 requires it but because it is proper for the Government to do so. After it was thought proper to place it before the House, it was also thought proper that so far as possible the spirit of Articles 202, 203 and 204 should be observed.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—May I just point out without meaning any offence to you that the position is this? So far as the financial powers of this House are concerned, they must arise and must be related to the Constitution.

(SRI K. PATTABIRAMAN)

If you say that the Government need not have placed this budget before this House and at the same time say that we are asked to vote on the Appropriation Bill that follows as a result of the budget, I would like to know what is the position.

Sri K. F. PATIL (Ranibennur).—What would have been the position of this House had the budget been thrown out? That will have to be considered.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Nothing would have happened. Government's position, technically would have remained unaffected. The Governor has authorised the expenditure. I find that there are many acts which are not prohibited by the Constitution. This is such an act and I think it was proper for the Government to do it and they have done it. I have gone into this matter deeply since it is an act which is not covered by the Constitution. I came to the conclusion that the budget should be placed before the House and that only discussion should take place on it and nothing more.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—How can we transact any business that is not covered by the Constitution?

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is not against the Constitution. The Hon'ble Member I am afraid, has not been, following the discussion properly. This question has been discussed and a ruling has been given by me on this point.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—May I know whether the withdrawals will be under this Appropriation Bill or under the powers which will be made under the States Reorganisation Act?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The appropriation would be made under the authority of the Government. I would rather agree with the Hon'ble friend Sri Srinivasa Iyenger when he said that all this was redundant. I agree to that extent. But sometimes we have to be necessarily redundant.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—Then should we not treat this as a serious business?

Mr. SPEAKER.—This is also a serious business. To discuss the budget is not a simple thing.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ (Sreerangapatna).—ಮೂರು ವಿಷಯಗಳಿಂದ ಒಂದೇ ಸಮನಾಗಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಿದ ಮೇಲೆ, ಈಗ ಈ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕವೆಂದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹೊಳೆದಿದೆ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾನು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

Sri T. MARIAPPA (Minister for Finance).—Only one point I have to say because my friend Sri Kolkebail unfortunately happened to make a remark against the officers drawn from different areas. There was an implied motive. I want to refute statement.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will put the Bill to the House. The question is :

“That the Mysore Appropriation Bill, 1956, be considered.”

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Mysore Appropriation Bill, 1956, is considered. The Bill will be read clause by clause. As there are no amendments I will put all these clauses to vote.

The question is :

“That Clauses 2, 3 and 1, the Schedule the title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2, 3 and 1, the Schedule and the title and Preamble were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass

Sri T. MARIAPPA.—I beg to move :

“That the Mysore Appropriation Bill, 1956, be passed.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That the Mysore Appropriation Bill, 1956, be passed.”

The motion was adopted.

MYSORE LEGISLATURE (PROHIBITION OF SIMULTANEOUS MEMBERSHIP) BILL, 1956.

Motion to consider.

*Sri M. V. RAMA RAO (Minister for Home and Legal Affairs).—Sir, I move

“That the Mysore Legislature (Prohibition of Simultaneous Membership) Bill, 1956, as passed